

Serial No. **10/784,774**
Amendment dated August 17, 2006
Reply to Office Action of May 23, 2006

Docket No. **P-0644**

REMARKS

By the present response, Applicant has canceled claims 8 and 12-16 without disclaimer. Further, Applicant has amended claims 1, 6, 9, 10, 17, 21, 23, 24, 36 and 39 to further clarify the invention. Claims 1-7, 9-11 and 17-40 remain pending in this application.

In the Office Action, claims 1-40 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,272,316 (Wiedeman et al.).

1449 Form Attached to Office Action

Applicant notes that the Examiner has crossed out the Korean reference 10 2002-0078911 on the copy of Applicant's 1449 form filed February 24, 2004 and attached to the back of the current Office Action. During a telephone call to the Examiner regarding this, the Examiner stated that either the reference did not get scanned or was lost. Applicant is resubmitting a copy of this reference for consideration by the Examiner.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections

Claims 1-40 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Wiedeman et al. Claims 8 and 12-16 have been canceled. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections as to the remaining pending claims.

Wiedeman et al. discloses operating a satellite communication system of a type that has a plurality of earth orbiting satellites, at least one terrestrial user terminal, and at least one terrestrial gateway, and includes determining a location and an azimuthal orientation of the user

terminal, determining locations of one or more satellites co-visible to the user terminal and to the gateway, determining a signal quality of paths to each satellite co-visible with the gateway, displaying a representation to an operator of the user terminal, the representation depicting at least the orientation of the user terminal, the determined location of the one or more satellites, and the determined signal qualities for satellites that are in use and those that are not in use, and changing the location of the user terminal in response to the displayed representation.

Regarding claims 1, 6, 9, 21, 24, 36 and 39, Applicants submit that Wiedeman et al. does not disclose or suggest the limitations in the combination of each of these claims of, *inter alia*, measuring a received signal strength in the direction that the mobile terminal is pointed, or displaying a receiving sensitivity graph which indicates the newly measured direction and corresponding signal strength simultaneously with at least one previously stored measured direction of the mobile terminal and corresponding measured received signal strength. The Examiner asserts that Wiedeman discloses measuring a received signal strength at col. 8 lines 42-49 and col. 10 lines 21-31. However, these portions merely disclose that the links shown in figure 9B may result from the user terminal monitoring pilot channels received through the co-visible satellites where the link indications may be based on pilot channel signal strength, and an unattended stationary user terminal may receive pilot signals from satellites and stores the record of the received signal quality or signal strength. This is not measuring a received signal strength in the direction the mobile terminal is pointed, as recited in the claims of the present application.

Wiedemann et al. merely discloses signal strength to a particular satellite. Wiedeman et al. relates to determining a signal quality of paths to each satellite. In Wiedeman, the user terminal is held in an upright position with the antenna orientated vertically and the display facing the user, and the compass rotates on the display showing the positioning of the user terminal with respect to the satellites (see, col. 8, lines 5-19). In contrast, the limitations in the claims of the present application relate to measuring received signal strength in the direction that the mobile terminal is pointed where the signal strength will vary as the direction of the mobile terminal varies. This is not disclosed nor suggested in Wiedeman et al., which merely relates to signal strength to a stationary device from satellites.

The Examiner further asserts that Wiedeman discloses displaying a receiving a sensitivity graph which indicates the newly measured direction and corresponding signal strength, in claims 32 and 33, col. 12, lines 5-12, col. 13, line 15, col. 14, line 48 and col. 16, line 14. However, these portions merely disclose that the user terminal contains a controller for operating the user terminal over a period of time at a certain location so as to store a record of satellite availability at the location and transmits stored records from the terminal to the gateway for storage, and that the controller can calculate or look up the position of the satellites. This is not a controller that controls a memory to store a newly-measured direction of the mobile terminal and a corresponding signal strength when the mobile direction changes, and controls the display unit to display a receiving sensitivity graph which indicates the newly measured direction and

corresponding signal strength simultaneously with at least one previously stored measured direction of the mobile terminal and corresponding measured received signal strength, as recited in the claims of the present application. These portions merely disclose that the terminal has a controller that performs various functions. Wiedeman et al. does not disclose or suggest controlling a display to display a receiving sensitivity graph which includes the newly measured direction and corresponding signal strength simultaneously with at least one previously stored measured direction of the mobile terminal and corresponding measured received signal strength.

Regarding claims 2-5, 7, 10, 11, 17-20, 22, 23, 25-35, 37, 38 and 40, Applicant submits that these claims are dependent on one of independent claims 1, 6, 9, 21, 24, 36 and 39 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding these independent claims.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that Wiedeman et al. does not disclose or suggest the limitations in the combination of each of claims 1-7, 9-11 and 17-40 of the present application. Applicant respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Serial No. 10/784,774
Amendment dated August 17, 2006
Reply to Office Action of May 23, 2006

Docket No. P-0644

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that claims 1-7, 9-11, and 17-40 are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of such claims is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, Frederick D. Bailey, at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



Daniel Y.J. Kim, Esq.
Registration No. 36,186
Frederick D. Bailey
Registration No. 42,282

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
(703) 766-3701 DYK/FDB/tlg

Date: August 17, 2006

\\Fk4\Documents\2000\2000-753\95774.doc

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610